

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT  
DIVISION TWO

In re JACOB B. et al., Persons Coming  
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY SOCIAL  
SERVICES BUREAU,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ROY M. et al.,

Defendants and Appellants.

A107072

(Contra Costa County  
Super. Ct. Nos. J02-00869, J02-00870)

Respondent Contra Costa County Social Services Bureau seeks dismissal of this appeal on the grounds that the matter has been mooted by the adoption of the two children involved on December 31, 2004, and that the juvenile court no longer has jurisdiction over the matter as it dismissed the petitions and vacated the dependencies for the two children on January 12, 2005.<sup>1</sup> The motion is *unopposed* by appellants. The dismissal motion is accompanied by a request that we take judicial notice of two attached

---

<sup>1</sup> Parental rights were terminated on July 31, 2003. We affirmed on the parents' appeal in case No. A103556. The remittitur in that case was issued on November 29, 2004 and the case became final. On information and belief, County Counsel states that Jacob and Mary's adoption was finalized on or about December 31, 2004.

minute orders from a juvenile adoption review hearing dated January 12, 2005, vacating the dependencies and dismissing the petitions for Jacob B. and Mary B.

Appellant Patricia M. is the paternal aunt of the children and appellant Roy M. is her husband. They have appealed from the June 25, 2004 denial of their Welfare and Institutions Code section 827 petition for disclosure of juvenile court records and the denial of their section 388 petition for modification, by which they requested that the children be placed with them, leading to adoption, guardianship or long-term foster care.

Pursuant to respondent's request, we take judicial notice of the January 12, 2005 minute orders of the juvenile court entered at the adoption review hearing vacating the dependencies and dismissing the petitions for Jacob B. and Mary B. (Evid. Code, § 452, subd. (d).)

Consequently, it appears the appeal cannot be maintained, as all questions have become moot by the children's adoption and the court's orders vacating the dependencies and dismissing the petitions. Any alleged error in the juvenile court's orders of June 25, 2004 are rendered moot as any action by us would be without practical effect, because the juvenile court no longer has jurisdiction. (See *In re Dani R.* (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 402, 404 [“ ‘[A]n action that originally was based on a justiciable controversy cannot be maintained on appeal if all the questions have become moot by subsequent acts or events. A reversal in such a case would be without practical effect, and the appeal will therefore be dismissed.’ (9 Witkin, Cal. Procedure (4th ed. 1997) Appeal, § 642, p. 669)”]; *In re Michelle M.* (1992) 8 Cal.App.4th 326, 330 [“Here, no direct relief can be granted even were we to find reversible error, because the juvenile court no longer has jurisdiction and we are only reviewing that court's ruling”].)

Respondent's motion to dismiss the instant appeal as moot is granted and the appeal is hereby dismissed.

---

Kline, P.J.

We concur:

---

Lambden, J.

---

Ruvolo, J.